



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

AGENDA

DATE/TIME: Monday, May 16, 2005 7:00 p.m.

**LOCATION: Police Department Auditorium
870 Santa Barbara Drive**

Roll Call

1. Minutes of March 21, 2005 (draft minutes attached)
2. Report from Membership Subcommittee
 - Notice of Preparation (NOP) for Hoag Hospital amendments to Development Agreement, General Plan, and Planned Community Development Criteria and District Regulations (report attached)
3. Report from EQAC Representative to GPUC
4. Report from EQAC Members on GPAC
5. Economic Development Committee (EDC) Representative's Report
6. Council Member Reports
7. Report from Staff on Current Projects
8. Public Comments
9. Future Agenda Items
10. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING DATE: June 20, 2005

*Attachments can be found on the City's website <http://www.city.newport-beach.ca.us>. Once there, click on **City Council**, then scroll to and click on **Agendas and Minutes** then scroll to and click on **Environmental Quality Affairs**. If attachment is not on the web page, it is also available in the City of Newport Beach Planning Department, 3300 Newport Boulevard, Building C, 2nd Floor.



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACTION COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES 3-21-05

Minutes of the Environmental Quality Action Committee held at the City of Newport Beach Police Department Auditorium, 870 Santa Barbara Drive, on **Monday, March 21, 2005**.

Members Present:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steve Rosansky, Council Member	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Walter Lazicki
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Richard Nichols, Council Member	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sandra Haskell
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cris Trapp, Chairperson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Barry Allen
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dolores Otting, Vice Chair - Excused	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kristine Adams
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Phillip Lugar	<input type="checkbox"/>	Marianne Zippi - Excused
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jeannette Thomas	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tom Hyans – Sick Leave
<input type="checkbox"/>	Matt Wiley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jack Wu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Christopher Welsh - Excused	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Winn
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mike Browning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ray Halowski
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brent Cooper - Excused	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Carol Hoffman
<input type="checkbox"/>	Laura Dietz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Barbara Thibault
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kenneth Drellishak	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Merritt Van Sant

Staff Representatives:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sharon Wood, Assistant City Manager
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Guests Present:

Wayne Zippi	Phillip Bettencourt
-------------	---------------------

Chairperson Trapp called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm

No quorum present – Agenda Item 3 heard first (no action required.)

1. Presentation by Transportation and Development Services Manager Rich Edmonston
 - Traffic studies, impacts and mitigations

Mr. Edmonston distributed a handout and discussed the Traffic Phasing Ordinance (TPO), cumulative and GPA traffic studies. He also hosted a question-and-answer session.

2. Minutes of February 28, 2005

Motion: Ray Halowski to approve minutes
Seconded: Barbara Thibault
Motion passes unanimously

3. Election of Vice Chair

Motion: Ray Haskell to appoint Dolores Otting

Seconded: Barry Allen

Motion passes unanimously

4. Subcommittee Report on the South Coast Shipyard NOP (draft report attached)

Motion: Carol Hoffman to approve the NOP as amended

Seconded: Phillip Lugar

Motion passes unanimously

5. Report from Membership Subcommittee - No report

6. Report from EQAC Representative to GPUC - No report

7. Report from EQAC Members on GPAC

Philip Lugar and Sharon Wood reported on the meeting of March 7, 2005.

8. Economic Development Committee (EDC) Representative's Report

Carol Hoffman reported on the meeting of March 16, 2005.

9. Council Member Reports

Council Member Rosansky reported on the City Hall outreach meetings.

10. Report from staff on current projects - No report

11. Public Comment - None

12. Future Agenda Items - None

13. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

draft

Memorandum

To: Environmental Quality Affairs Citizens Advisory Committee (AEQAC@) City of Newport Beach ("City")

From: Hoag Master Plan Subcommittee; EQAC
City of Newport Beach

Subject: Notice of Preparation ("NOP") for the Hoag Hospital Master Plan Amendment (the AProject@)

Date: May 11, 2005

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the Hoag Hospital Master Plan Amendment. Listed below are our comments.

Project Description

The NOP contains an incomplete and confusing proposed Project description, which the SEIR should complete and clarify.

The Project Description identifies the "General Plan Maximum allowable building areas" as 765,349 square feet for the Upper Campus and 577,889 square feet for the Lower Campus. The NOP proposes adding 5,592 square feet to the Lower Campus building area (bringing it to 583,481 square feet.) as the result of vacation of an unused easement by the City. (Page 2) The SEIR should clarify the location of the easement, identify who owns the underlying fee and describe the current easement use.

The Project Description further proposes the addition of 24,215 square feet to the building area because the existing cogeneration facility is "non-occupied" and "does not materially increase vehicle trip generation." It is unclear what "non-occupied" means. The SEIR should describe the current use for the cogeneration facility and provide a clear comparison of the current vehicle trip generation and the change due to the proposed Project. Further, the SEIR should clarify how the addition of the addition of the 24,215 square feet would not create additional vehicle trip generation.

The total allowable building area now is 1,343,238 square feet of development. This doesn't include, because of the 2002 amendment, "buildings" that are "non-occupied." The SEIR should clarify how much of the current allowable 1,343,238 square feet is built at this time.

The NOP states that the addition of both of these areas would increase maximum allowable building area on the Upper and Lower Campuses to 1,373,045 square feet. However, the document proposes a maximum Upper Campus building area of 990,349 square feet and a maximum Lower Campus building area of 583,481 square feet. This represents a total of 1,528,830 square feet of maximum allowable building area, but the NOP states: "In no event could the building areas of both the Upper and Lower Campuses exceed 1,373,045 square feet." This discrepancy should be

clarified in the SEIR. The SEIR should include the site plan on the Upper and Lower Campuses, including plans for a new and/or expanded cogeneration facility. (Page 3)

The Project Description section states: "Other changes may be required in the Hoag Hospital PC text to reflect and be consistent with changes to the Development Agreement and General Plan indicated above and/or to provide clarification of standards applicable to future development approvals." Given the discrepancy in the maximum allowable building area cited above, there are concerns that the "other changes" may be related to this additional 155,785 square foot of development rights above the alleged "maximum," and that these other changes may not be included in the traffic report or other studies that assess the proposed Project's impacts. Again, the SEIR should fully address and clarify this discrepancy in the maximum allowable building area. (Page 3)

Environmental Checklist

Aesthetics

This section addresses the potential aesthetic impacts associated with the proposed Project. The Upper Campus construction will be sited over the existing footprint (after demolition), and while it will be higher, it does not exceed existing maximum building height or setbacks. A landscaping plan will require screening equipment and trash from public view, clean rooftops (no mechanical equip) and softening the architecture with plantings.

According to the NOP, several mitigation measures associated with aesthetics that were adopted for Final EIR No. 142 will apply to the proposed Project. Mitigation Measure 48 states that "(p)rior to issuance of a building permit for any Lower Campus structure, the Project Sponsor shall prepare a study of each proposed building project to assure conformance with the EIR view impact analysis and the PCDP and District Regulations, to ensure that the visual impacts identified in the EIR are consistent with actual Master Plan development." The SEIR should fully address these view impacts. The study of each proposed building project should be included in the SEIR.

While care has been taken to minimize light spillage and concealment of light sources, given the close proximity of residential housing on the both campuses, the SEIR should include restrictions on all non-essential lighting. For example, the SEIR should provide a mitigation measure that would restrict architectural lights after 10:00 PM.

Air Quality

The NOP deals with air quality issues in and around the proposed Project area and ends with a commitment to identify "sensitive receptor areas within the proposed Project vicinity." The SEIR should expand the commitment to include receptors in the adjacent neighborhoods, where there is a heavy concentration of residential housing, and should include a commitment to any necessary mitigation. (Page 16)

The NOP further proposes "increasing the capacity of the cogeneration facility that serves the hospital." The size and location of this facility should be detailed in the SEIR so that factors in addition to air quality can be evaluated. Specifically, noise impacts of this increased size cogeneration facility should be addressed in detail in Section XI – Noise. (Page 16)

Mitigation measures 37, 88, 96, 97, 98 and 99 put heavy emphases on "energy efficiency" items in the Air Quality section of this NOP. It is not clear why these measures are included in this section unless they relate to a plan to add on-site electrical power generation equipment. If this is so, the cogeneration facility must be planned for expansion, and all aspects this should be discussed in detail in the SEIR. (Pages 17 and 18)

This section states that the City, not the applicant, is responsible for CEQA documentation related to "new significant impacts" resulting from the proposed Project, and the applicant proposes to transfer its responsibility for

generation of this CEQA documentation to the City. Please identify the CEQA reference that authorizes this transfer of responsibility. Also, please confirm that “air quality analysis” identified in the top paragraph on Page 19 is to be conducted by the Project Sponsor. (Pages 18 and 19)

The NOP proposes elimination of mitigation measure 109 because the AQMP has now been approved and obviates the need for it. Since the AQMP is used here and elsewhere in the NOP to relieve the Project Sponsor of various documentation and reporting requirements, specific references to AQMP sections should be cited in the SEIR if they are being used to eliminate previously approved Project Sponsor obligations. (Page 20)

The NOP states that no “objectionable odors” are anticipated from the proposed Project and that this issue will not be addressed in the SEIR. Since the proposed Project is in the vicinity of active seismic faults and producing oil fields, it seems that there is risk of releasing underground gases during some deep excavation and/or construction activities. Proof should be presented to assure that the “no objectionable odors” position by the Project Sponsor is substantiated by reliable data. (Page 21)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

According to the NOP, the majority of hazards and hazardous materials issues have been adequately addressed in the analysis conducted as part of the Final EIR No. 142. However, the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section states that there is one area that would have a significant impact unless appropriate mitigation is implemented. Subsection g states: “Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.” Mitigation Measure 101 “requires the preparation of the construction phasing plan to ensure that emergency access is maintained during construction activities.” The SEIR should include a detailed plan of action, more than the discussed study of on-site circulation, to discuss the emergency response and evacuation plans during the construction process as to not stress and/or cause more damage in the event of a site or neighboring emergency.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This section focuses on potential impacts to surface water hydrology, surface water quality, groundwater hydrology, and groundwater quality resulting from the development of the proposed Project.

Subsections a, b, c, d, e, and f should all be viewed as “Potential Significant Impact” as the upper area could be increased by almost 30 percent. This 30 percent increase represents an area of 225,000 square feet, which on its own is considered to be a significant area. The SEIR should evaluate all of these areas in-depth with the new highest possible numbers.

Land Use and Planning

This section states that the impacts of “placement of hospital buildings adjacent to the existing residential units, in combination with shade and shadow and noise impacts, were considered significant and unavoidable impacts of the Master Plan project” and were discussed in Final EIR No. 142. The section goes on to say that “(t)he proposed amendment to the Master Plan would not alter or make these impacts more severe...No new significant impacts to the larger community would be anticipated with the modifications proposed.” (Page 41)

The SEIR should fully discuss and analyze how the changes to the Master Plan that are proposed with this Project do not alter or make the land use impacts more severe to the surrounding residential community.

Noise

Mitigation Measure 40 proposes to mitigate interior noise levels over 45 CNEL “prior to occupancy of Master Plan facilities.” This seems to be a poor approach to noise mitigation since noise reduction/elimination at the source should be first priority. It may be expensive (or impossible) to solve the noise reduction problems “after the fact” rather than incorporating noise reduction measures into the initial design and construction processes. (Page 43)

Subsection f of this section asserts that there will be no noise impact due to usage of the helipad. Since “EIR 142 acknowledges that increases in population, and use of hospital facilities, may result in an increased need for emergency helicopter service,” the SEIR should, at least, discuss the impact of future increased emergency helicopter service commensurate with the increases in utilization that are implicit in the Hoag Hospital Master Plan. If future noise mitigation is needed, some measures might be implemented now that may be more difficult or not cost effective later. (Page 45)

Public Services

The Public Services section states that fire protection and police protection may be significantly impacted by the proposed Project, and it states that the mitigation measures that were adopted for Final EIR No. 142 would apply to the proposed Project. The SEIR should fully analyze the impacts of the proposed Project on “service ratios, response times and other performance objectives for any of the public services.” Further, the SEIR should provide a full discussion of the applicability of the mitigation measures that were adopted for Final EIR No. 142 to the proposed Project.

Transportation/Circulation

The NOP is unclear about the amount and location of parking required for the proposed Project. This section states that the proposed amendment would not alter the parking requirement. However, there is not enough information provided in the NOP for decision makers and the public to make such a determination.

The earlier plan for the Hoag Hospital Master Plan had an entirely different allocation of development between the Upper Campus and Lower Campus. With the new criteria and allocation of development between the Upper Campus and Lower Campus, the parking should be discussed in detail to insure that adequate parking would be provided in each respective area.

The SEIR should indicate: (a) the required parking for the requested square footage currently allowed; (b) the required parking for the requested square footage in the amended plan; (c) where the parking is located and the number of spaces in each location; (d) the number of spaces restricted for parking for doctors only and their location; (e) the number of spaces restricted for parking to employees and where they are located; (f) the location of available visitor and patient parking and the number of spaces. The SEIR should clarify that the parking requirements for the Upper Campus and Lower Campus will be met. (Page 51)

The Transportation/Circulation section states that the traffic study that will be prepared to evaluate implementation of the Hoag Hospital Mast Plan Project will include an “evaluation of future traffic conditions with the addition of cumulative projects and the proposed project.” The NOP does not indicate how the “cumulative projects” will be identified. The SEIR should clearly identify the cumulative projects being used and discuss the criteria used to identify them as such.

Mitigation Measure 34 describes specific intersections where improvement may be needed. These intersections, even if improved pursuant to Mitigation Measure 34 as part of the earlier master plan, should, nonetheless, be included in the list of intersections to be evaluated in the SEIR traffic study. (Page 50)

It would be helpful to persons evaluating the study and the SEIR to have the prior traffic studies and internal circulation studies that were submitted to the Director of Public Works and the City Traffic Engineer attached as exhibits to the new traffic study to be prepared pursuant to this SEIR.

The trip reduction plan for the construction crew members that was submitted earlier with EIR No. 142 should be attached as an exhibit to the new traffic study prepared pursuant to this SEIR. The term "transit incentives" as used in Mitigation Measure 108, should be explained and detailed.

The text preceding Mitigation Measure 26 indicates that the Measure would not be applicable to the proposed Project, and the Committee agrees. However, a copy of the study given to and approved by the City Traffic Engineer should be attached as an exhibit to the traffic study for this SEIR. (Page 50)

The text following Mitigation Measure 26 On page 50 under paragraph no. 26 references Mitigation Measure 24. However, Mitigation Measure 24 is not addressed in the NOP. (Page 50)

The NOP lists ten traffic measures that were adopted as part of Final EIR 142 and states that they would apply to the proposed Project. The traffic study for the SEIR should address all ten traffic measures in light of the additional impacts associated with the proposed Project, and if necessary, propose addition mitigation measures.

Utilities and Service Systems

This section analyzes the ways in which the proposed Project will strain the existing utilities and services. It looks at whether the proposed Project will exceed wastewater treatment requirements, require the construction of new water storm water drainage facilities, have sufficient water supplies and capacity to serve the projected demand and whether there will be sufficient solid waste disposal capacity.

The NOP considers that each of these potential environmental issues have less than significant impact based upon Final Program EIR No. 142, stating that there was adequate water supply and adequate sewer and service connections to serve build out of the Master Plan project. It also notes that there would be a potential need to expand the existing 15-inch City sewer trunk main. Final EIR No. 142 then indicated that the project would not substantially alter the amount of solid waste generated by the project.

These assertions are generalities, and the SEIR needs to narrow them to more specifically address the proposed Project. The SEIR should address more than the incorporation of water-saving devices for project lavatories and other water-using facilities and take into consideration any external or unexpected instances which would require increased water drainage and/or increased solid waste disposal.

As a new mitigation measure, the NOP notes that the contractor shall be required, to the extent practicable, to take the project demolition waste to an off site recycling location to minimize impacts to existing landfills and will require verification. The SEIR should emphasize this point and find language more persuasive to encourage participation.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

This section analyzes the mandatory findings, including the proposed Project's impact on and degradation of the environment, cumulative impacts and any impacts which may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Although the Environmental Checklist notes that the proposed Project may result in potentially significant impacts for each category, the NOP does not contain a section that addresses those impacts or proposed mitigation. The SEIR should fully discuss and analyze the proposed Project's impact on and degradation of the environment, cumulative impacts and any impacts which may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings and propose appropriate mitigation.